

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 21, 2004. Claims 1-25 have been allowed. Claims 26-37 were rejected. With this Response, claims 26, 30, and 33 have been amended. Claims 1-37 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner states that it is unclear which card guide is being referred to in claim 33. Claim 33 has been amended to include a card guide end adapted to couple to the second card guide of the electronic system. It is believed that amended claim 33 is definite as it distinctly claims and particularly points out subject matter of the claimed electronic system. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 33-34 and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 30-32, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Murphy U.S. Patent No. 4,979,075.

The Murphy Patent teaches at column 4, lines 34-56 (referencing FIG. 9) a carrier 20 installed into a computer system 100. Connectors 240, 241 are inserted into respective mating connectors 82, 81 of an electrical board 110. A top support bracket 201 is positioned such that one end 230 is in contact with ledge 107 of a front panel 101. The Murphy Patent teaches that a screw or other fastener can be inserted through the top support bracket 201 into the front panel 101 to fix the carrier 20 in place. With regard to full-length circuit boards 30, a leading edge 33 can be inserted into a support holder 90 at the rear surface of the front cover 101. To this end, the Murphy Patent does not teach or suggest insertion of the support 201 into the support holder 90 of the front cover 101.

In contrast, amended independent claim 30 includes an electronic system comprising a support extending from a first edge of a short card into a second card guide of the electronic system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these limitations of amended independent claim 30 are not taught or suggested by the Murphy Patent.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Andrew Harvey Barr et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,966

Filed: July 14, 2003

Docket No.: 200205324-1 (H300.202.101)

Title: SUPPORTING A SHORT PRINTED CIRCUIT CARD

Dependent claims 31-32, and 37 further define patentably distinct independent claim 30. Therefore, these dependent claims are believed to allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 30-32, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Murphy Patent be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Claims 30-31, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Reynolds et al. U.S. Patent No. 3,733,523.

The Reynolds et al. Patent teaches at column 2, lines 27-68 a card cage 10 having end panels 12, 14 supporting three guide panels including side panels 16 and 18 and an internal panel 20 (see FIG. 1). A generally planar web portion 33 (see FIG. 2) includes integral ribs 35 defining grooves 37 that extend transversely along each rib 35. The Reynolds et al. Patent teaches at column 4, lines 8-24 that the internal panel 20 can support a short card 63 such that a vertical plane 58 of the internal panel 20 extends along one edge of the short card 63. As best illustrated in FIG. 1 of the Reynolds et al. Patent, neither the vertical plane 58 nor the internal panel 20 extend from the first edge of the short card 63 into a card guide of the electronic system.

By contrast, amended independent claim 30 includes an electronic system comprising a support extending from a first edge of a short card into a second card guide of the electronic system. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these limitations of amended independent claim 30 are not taught or suggested by the Reynolds et al. Patent.

Dependent claims 31 and 37 further define patentably distinct independent claim 30. Therefore, these dependent claims are believed to allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 30-31, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Reynolds Patent be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Claims 26-34, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Carney et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,706,173. The Examiner's clarification of the reference numerals referred to when applying the Carney et al. Patent reference is noted with appreciation.

In this regard, the Carney et al. Patent teaches a support 36 for a long PCI card 34 in a computer enclosure 21. The support 36 taught by the Carney et al. Patent employs two brackets 43, 48 secured by two screws 42, 47 to the computer enclosure 21. A top contactor 41 of the support 36 is capped in place by a top 23 of computer enclosure 21. To this end, the

support 36 taught by the Carney et al. Patent does not insert into a card guide of the computer enclosure 21, but is instead fixed in place by the screws 42, 47.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to accord with certain limitations of allowed independent claims 1, 10, and 18. In particular, amended claim 26 includes supporting a second edge of a short printed circuit card with a short card support comprising a card receptor end removably attached to the second edge of the short printed circuit card, a card guide end adapted to removably insert into a second card guide of the electronic system, and a support span connecting the card receptor end and the card guide end. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations of amended claim 26 are not taught or suggested by the Carney et al. Patent.

As noted above, amended independent claim 30 includes an electronic system comprising a support extending from a first edge of a short card into a second card guide of the electronic system. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations of amended claim 30 are not taught or suggested by the Carney et al. Patent.

Dependent claims 27-29 further define patentably distinct independent claim 26, and dependent claims 31-34 and 37 further define patentably distinct independent claim 30. Therefore, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 26-34, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on the Carney et al. Patent be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the Carney et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,706,173.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 30 is not taught or suggested by the Carney et al. Patent. Dependent claims 35-36 further define patentably distinct amended independent claim 30. Thus, it is believed that claims 35-36 are allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 35-36 based on the Carney et al. Patent be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116
Applicant: Andrew Harvey Barr et al.
Serial No.: 10/618,966
Filed: July 14, 2003
Docket No.: 200205324-1 (H300.202.101)
Title: SUPPORTING A SHORT PRINTED CIRCUIT CARD

Allowable Subject Matter

It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-25 have been allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that in addition to allowed claims 1-25, pending claims 26-37 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims 1-37 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

• **Amendment and Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.116**

Applicant: Andrew Harvey Barr et al.

Serial No.: 10/618,966

Filed: July 14, 2003

Docket No.: 200205324-1 (H300.202.101)

Title: SUPPORTING A SHORT PRINTED CIRCUIT CARD

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' representative at the below-listed numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Patrick G. Billig at Telephone No. (612) 573-2003, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005 or David A. Plettner at Telephone No. (408) 447-3013, Facsimile No. (408) 447-0854. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Harvey Barr et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2003
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 11-22-04
PGB: kle


Patrick G. Billig
Reg. No. 38,080

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 22 day of November, 2004.

By 
Name: Patrick G. Billig